

Meeting of the
Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC)
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

March 9, 2010

Minutes

Members/Alternates

Air Resources Board (ARB)	Ms. Terry	Roberts	L
Air Resources Board (ARB) - alternate	Mr. Earl	Withycombe	
American Automobile Association (AAA)	Ms. Marianne	Kim	
American Automobile Association (AAA) - alternate	Mr. Steve	Finnegan	
Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)/Mojave Desert AQMD (MDAQMD)	Mr. Alan	De Salvio	
Arroyo Verdugo	Mr. Fred	Zohrehvand	
Arroyo Verdugo - alternate	Mr. Greg	Herrmann	
California Department of Finance	Ms. Mary	Heim	E
Caltrans District 7	Ms. Leann	Williams	T
Caltrans District 7 - alternate	Ms. Tahirih	Smith	
Caltrans District 8	Mr. Mark	Roberts	T
Caltrans District 8 - alternate	Mr. James	Camarillo	T
Caltrans District 11	Mr. Maurice	Eaton	
Caltrans District 11 - alternate	Ms. Christine	Antoine	T
Caltrans District 12	Ms. Maureen	El Harake	T
Caltrans District 12 - alternate	Mr. Everett	Evans	
City of Los Angeles	Mr. Miles	Mitchell	L
City of Los Angeles - alternate	Ms. Naomi	Guth	L
Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG)	Mr. Jacob I.	Alvarez	
Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) - alternate	Ms. Aurora	Wilson	
County of Los Angeles	Mr. Mark	Herwick	L
County of Los Angeles - alternate	Ms. Connie	Chung	
County of Riverside	Dr. William	Gayk	L
County of Riverside - alternate	Mr. JiHong	McDermott	
Federal Highway Administration	Ms. Michelle	Noch	L
Federal Highway Administration - alternate	Ms. Aimee	Kratovil	
Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG)	Ms. Nancy	Pfeffer	
Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) - alternate	Ms. Karen	Heit	
Imperial County Air Pollution Control District	Mr. Matt	Dessert	
Imperial County Air Pollution Control District - alternate	Ms. Monica	Soucier	
Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC - formerly IVAG)	Mr. Mark	Baza	I
Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC - formerly IVAG) - alternate	Ms. Rosa	Lopez	T
Las Virgenes/Malibu Council of Governments	Mr. Marc	Seferian	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)	Ms. Lori	Abrishami	L
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) - alternate	Ms. Sarah	Jepson	L
Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)	Ms. Valerie	Edwards	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Mr. Michael	Hollis	

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC) Minutes

March 9, 2010

Page 2

North Los Angeles County - North	Mr. Richard	Kite	T
North Los Angeles County - North - alternate	Mr. Mike	Behen	T
North Los Angeles County - South	Ms. Lisa	Webber	
North Los Angeles County - South - alternate	Mr. David	Peterson	L
Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG)	Ms. Kristine	Murray	
Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) - alternate	Mr. Deborah	Diep	L
Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)	Mr. Charlie	Larwood	L
Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) - alternate	Mr. Greg	Nord	X
Port of Long Beach	Mr. Eric	Shen	E
Port of Long Beach - alternate	Ms. Jolene	Hayes	
Port of Los Angeles	Mr. Kerry	Cartwright	E
Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)	Ms. Shirley	Medina	
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)	Mr. Ty	Schuling	S
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) - alternate	Mr. Steve	Smith	S
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)	Mr. Bill	Trimble	L
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) - alternate	Mr. Larry	Stevens	
SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs)	Ms. Kim	Uhlich	T
SCAG Region Special Districts	Mr. David	Cordero	
South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)	Ms. Kim	Fuentes	
South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) - alternate	Mr. Walter	Siembab	L
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	Ms. Carol A.	Gomez	L
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) - alternate	Ms. Kathryn	Higgins	L
Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA)	Ms. Valarie	McFall	E
Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA) - alternate	Mr. Sam	Elters	
University of Irvine (UCI) Department of Planning, Policy & Design	Mr. Marlon	Boarnet	
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD)	Ms. Genie	McGaugh	V
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) - alternate	Mr. Alan	Ballard	
Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) / Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG)	Mr. Steve	DeGeorge	V
Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG)	Mr. Kevin	Viera	E
Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) - alternate	Ms. Danielle	Coats	
Westside Cities Council of Governments	Ms. Diana	Chang	T
Westside Cities Council of Governments - alternate	Ms. Martha	Eros	

Non-Members

City of Highland	Mr. John	Jacquess	S
City of Irvine	Ms. Marika	Modugno	L
City of Mission Viejo	Ms. Gail	Shiomoto-Lohr	L
City of Ontario	Mr. Richard	Ayala	L
IBI Group	Ms. Christina	de Freitas	T
Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG)	Mr. David	Simpson	T

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC) Minutes

March 9, 2010

Page 3

SCAG Staff

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Naresh	Amatya	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Grieg	Asher	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Matt	Gleason	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Ms. Pria	Hidisyen	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Ryan	Kuo	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Jacob	Lieb	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Ms. Huasha	Liu	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Rongsheng	Luo	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Rich	Macias	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Ms. Rosanna Bayon	Moore	I
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Jonathan	Nadler	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. John	Procter	V
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Arnold	San Miguel	S
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Arnie	Sherwood	L
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Mr. Frank	Wen	L

Key:

(L) In person–LA (I) In person–Imperial (R) In person–Riverside (S) In person–San Bernardino

(V) In person–Ventura (X) In person–Other (T) Teleconference (E) Excused Absence

* Represented by temporary alternate

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, City of Mission Viejo, offered comments with respect to Agenda Item 5.1 "The SB 375/SCS Technical Methodology." She:

- a) Expressed thanks on behalf of the City of Mission Viejo (specifically Mayor Patricia Kelley) for having the revised Technical Methodology come before the P&P TAC for review and discussion, and recognized the effort to have this Methodology approved by the Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee, and then subsequently transmitted to the California Air Resources Board (ARB);
- b) Advised P&P TAC Members that the City of Mission Viejo prepared and submitted very detailed technical comments and questions to SCAG staff persons Jonathan Nadler and Dr. Frank Wen with the hope that these comments and questions will assist in their efforts to clarify the Technical Methodology; and
- c) Informed the P&P TAC that the intent of the detailed comments she submitted was to clarify the assumptions and the variables underlying SCAG's existing model, its newly developed models, and the post-processing capabilities that will be used to calculate Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions.

3.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

No changes were made.

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of February 10, 2010 P&P TAC Meeting

Approved with the following corrections:

- 1) Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, City of Mission Viejo, requested that the public comments she made during the "Regional Housing Needs Assessment" (RHNA) presentation by Joe Carreras, SCAG staff, be included.
 - 2) Dr. William Gayk, County of Riverside, asked that his questions raised during the RHNA presentation with respect to the treatment of tribal lands be recorded in the minutes.
-

5.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 SB 375/SCS Technical Methodology

Jonathan Nadler, Manager of Transportation Modeling, Air Quality & Conformity, presented an update and provided a handout on the “SCAG SB 375/SCS Technical Methodology and Related Processes for Estimating GHG Emissions” (Working Draft, Feb. 24, 2010).

As the accompanying handout stated and Mr. Nadler reiterated: “Prior to a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) formally taking credit for implementing the public participation plan required by SB 375, the MPO must submit to the California Air Resources Board (ARB) a description of the technical methodology it intends to use to estimate the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from its Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and, if appropriate, its Alternate Planning Strategy (APS). SB 375 encourages the MPO to work with the ARB until the ARB Board concludes that the technical methodology operates accurately.” Mr. Nadler’s presentation focused on ARB’s flexibility in allowing SCAG to prove the adequacy of its technical methodology in addition to touching upon other related issues.

In its role as the MPO, SCAG has been working to develop a technical methodology which can assure the ARB that its projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions will be reasonable. At the same time, ARB is holding all MPOs in the State to this same standard and seeking to obtain their technical methodologies as soon as possible. ARB’s goal is to ensure that these methodologies are developed in a reasonable, consistent, and coordinated manner to meet GHG emissions standards at the state level.

With the flexibility permitted by ARB, SCAG is able to consider and receive credit for a wide variety of technical methodology strategies in its efforts to determine the impact to greenhouse gas emissions through a regional SCS. Included are strategies based upon traditional models and tools (e.g., SCAG’s trip-based regional transportation demand model, ARB’s EMFAC model, and the PECAS land use model). ARB is also allowing strategies—such as off-model analyses—which are not readily modeled but which are supported by empirical evidence that suggests that they would reduce GHG emission levels.

SCAG is now working with ARB and other MPOs in the State to develop and agree upon a set of off-model analyses which will consistently give similar types of answers for similar types of policies. These off-model analyses will be incorporated along with other strategies into a final draft of the “SCAG SB 375/SCS Technical Methodology and Related Processes for Estimating GHG Emissions” document [an updated version of the February 24, 2010, Working

Draft handout provided during the presentation]. Mr. Nadler noted that Gail Shiimoto-Lohr submitted a number of comments on the Technical Methodology Draft to assist with technical clarification. Other P&P TAC members and subregional representatives who have questions or input are asked to contact Mr. Nadler as soon as possible. SCAG staff will submit the document (revised as necessary) to the Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee for review, then to the SCAG Board (the Regional Council) for approval, before being forwarded to the ARB.

Terry Roberts, California Air Resources Board (ARB), said that ARB staff members are not experts in traffic modeling, especially in terms of each MPO's individual model. Therefore, reviewing each MPO's technical methodology would help the ARB better understand the MPO's demonstration of how its SCS would meet its GHG emissions target. She added that off-model tools included in the technical methodologies could also include non-modeling tools, such as information from case studies or new research.

Steve Smith, SANBAG, asked how off-model analysis relates to the sustainability tool. According to Mr. Nadler, an off-model analysis is any information that could help validate a reduction in GHG emissions attributable to something that is not specifically modeled. The sustainability tool is just one example of this type of analysis. Subregions can use the sustainability tool to do sustainability and land use planning at the local level, then provide the resulting information to SCAG to supplement its GHG emission research and regional SCS analysis.

In response to a question by Greg Nord, OCTA, Mr. Nadler said that SCAG must have its technical methodology approved before it could begin work on the public participation requirements of the SCS. SCAG's previous public participation with its stakeholders does not apply towards fulfillment of these requirements.

Mr. Nadler agreed with the assertion of Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair, that the Technical Methodology document was essentially laying out the ground rules for the development of SCAG's numerical estimates related to air quality issues concerning the SCS (both regional and subregional). The full analysis related to the preparation of the final SCS will be done over the upcoming year. The technical methodology is only a part of this process.

5.2 Scenario Planning for SB 375 Target-Setting

Jacob Lieb, Manager of Environmental Assessment Services, discussed SCS scenario planning in relation to the SB 375 target-setting process. Several possible scenarios were presented via a table handout entitled "Potential SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy Scenarios for Target Setting Input – 2020 and 2035."

Mr. Lieb noted that the SCS scenarios shown on the table handout were the result of consultation and discussions with other MPOs in the State and with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) as part of a process outlined by the Regional Target Advisory Committee (RTAC) Report. As the scenarios continue to be reviewed and refined, SCAG staff will also be working to finalize the required technical work related to SB 375 target setting, including obtaining input through a number of subregional workshops. Future meetings with the CEHD Committee and the Regional Council are also planned to address the policy implications of these scenarios and obtain final approvals prior to making a submission to the ARB.

SCAG's goal is to make a solid recommendation of a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions target to the ARB by the end of June 2010. Next, ARB will put out a draft for review and comment as part of the more formal process that will conclude in September 2010 with the finalization of a GHG target.

With unlimited time and resources, SCAG staff could have created an infinite variety of SCS scenarios. Instead, SCAG pursued the more reasonable goal of developing five potential SCS scenarios. These scenarios were created to establish outer boundaries on both ends of how the SCAG region might perform in developing an SCS. Variations within those outer boundaries were also reflected. An effort was made to represent all (or most) of the key elements that might impact a regional SCS, including: a land use pattern, a transportation network, and a sample pricing measure. Also included were a set of assumptions about travel demand management (TDM), travel system management (TSM), non-motorized options, and transit network improvements. It was also noted that the local input or general plan information on the land use side would form the basis for any strategy SCAG developed. In addition, future adjustments will need to be made after individual scenarios are run to allow for an expected negative impact on transit funding due to the struggling economy.

SCS Scenario #1 was identified as the base case, or least aggressive in terms of strategy assumptions and implementation.

Scenario #5 was designed to represent the upper end of what could be done and included the most aggressive strategies across the board (e.g., highly optimized land use assumptions and aggressive assumptions with respect to TDM, TSM, non-motorized trips, and transit). While Scenario #5 would achieve the most results, it was deemed unfeasible and therefore likely to be further refined before being presented in upcoming subregional workshops.

Scenarios #2, #3, and #4 reflected a mix of the policies—mild and aggressive (#2 and #4), or moderate (#3)—to establish a mid-range. SCAG is uncertain of what

results these mid-range scenarios might generate, but is hopeful that at least one might help the region meet its desired GHG emissions target.

SCAG will submit these (or similar) SCS scenarios for feedback during the upcoming subregional workshops. It is hoped that the final scenarios can be implemented in a way that will meet SB 375 legislation objectives without over-committing the SCAG region.

Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, requested that the language used in Scenario #2 to describe its land use assumption be revised to describe “local input” instead of “local input/general plan.” He reasoned that in some cases, local input for local governments was not entirely consistent with the general plans for these governments. To use the term “local input/general plan” might give the wrong impression. Further clarification was also suggested for the land use description used in Scenario #2 versus Scenarios #3. Mr. Schuiling stated that Scenario #2 was probably already optimized to some degree relative to trend even though the current language did not reflect this. Therefore, describing Scenario #3 as “moderately” optimized without a similar language adjustment to Scenario #2 could also be misleading. Finally, Mr. Schuiling expressed concern that no transportation-funding-related strategies or assumptions were reflected as part of the SCS scenarios presented. He felt that this was particularly important as the federal government considers increasing fuel taxes to sustain its current level of transportation funding.

Mr. Lieb replied that perhaps some adjustments could be made in the future to account for the issues Mr. Schuiling had concerns about (particularly in terms of semantics), but that the timeframe constraints SCAG was facing would limit its ability to comprehensively examine the other issues (e.g., transit funding). However, SCAG might eventually be able to develop “after-the-model” scenarios to reflect such issues at some point in the future.

Deborah Diep, OCCOG, asked for clarification concerning the meaning of table references “A1” and “A3” and suggested that the clarification be included with the table’s footnotes. Mr. Lieb explained that these terms referred to Amendment 1 and Amendment 3.

Ms. Diep also noted that the term “Phase 2” was explained in the table footnotes in terms of its relationship to high speed rail, but not the term “Phase 1.” Naresh Amatya, SCAG staff, explained that “High-Speed Rail Phase 1” referred to the Anaheim-to-L.A. segment and the L.A.-to-Palmdale segment. He agreed that SCAG staff should revise the table accordingly.

In response to a question from Steve Smith, SANBAG, Mr. Amatya indicated that footnote number 5 on the table would be corrected to describe the geographic

range of the “High-Speed Rail Phase 2” as including a segment from “L.A. to San Diego via the Inland Empire” (instead of “L.A. to San Diego”).

Miles Mitchell, City of Los Angeles, inquired as to whether the feasibility of the proposed SCS Scenarios—in terms of political support and funding—could be included in the future as an additional consideration, and reflected by color coding the scenarios to reflect their feasibility levels. Mr. Lieb stated that SCAG was considering how to factor the issue of feasibility into future scenarios, but no set determination had yet been made.

Mr. Lieb informed the P&P TAC that three upcoming target-setting subregional roundtables have been scheduled for March 2010: a Ventura County COG meeting on March 25th, a San Gabriel Valley COG meeting on March 29th, and an Orange County COG meeting on March 31st. Two meetings have already been held—one for Imperial County and one for Westside Cities. SCAG is also in the process of contacting the other nine subregions to solicit input from them as well.

5.2 RTP Guidelines

Naresh Amatya, SCAG staff, advised P&P TAC members of SCAG’s latest efforts concerning the RTP Guidelines. He noted that since his last report, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) had released a final draft of the RTP Guidelines. The primary emphasis of this current Guidelines update is to incorporate the requirements of SB 375, in addition to a number of other provisions.

SCAG’s focus in reviewing and working with the CTC has been to make sure that the RTP Guidelines are consistent with the law (SB 375), and do not over interpret its requirements.

To help guide this process, two subcommittees were formed: one considered the policy arena and the other focused on modeling aspects. A number of workgroups also participated, looking at specific issues like housing and the RTAC report. The final draft now out for public review and comment reflects the collective input from these subcommittees and workgroups that went into the process. The SB 375 statute requires that the CTC conduct two hearings, one in the north and one in the south. The hearing in the north occurred around the end of February 2010. The hearing in the south is scheduled for April 6-7, 2010, and will be held in the City of Irvine. The CTC plans to adopt the new RTP Guidelines shortly after this time.

6.0 STAFF REPORT

(Ryan Kuo, SCAG staff)

Ryan Kuo, SCAG staff, reported on recent developments concerning the draft RTP Amendment #3. He informed the P&P TAC that this Amendment was released on February 17, 2010 for public review. Any comments or concerns about the Amendment should be directed to SCAG staff. Mr. Kuo stated that the public comment period will close on March 19th and that any revisions will be addressed before the proposed final version is brought before SCAG's Transportation Committee and Regional Council in April for adoption. After adoption, the Amendment would then be sent to the federal reviewing agencies.

7.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Miles Mitchell, City of Los Angeles, requested that an updated version of the chart entitled "Potential SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy Scenarios for Target Setting Input – 2020 and 2035" be provided at the next P&P TAC meeting. (This chart was referenced during the "Scenario Planning for SB 375 Target-Setting" presentation by Jacob Lieb.)

Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, requested that a future meeting topic address the issue of telework in terms of state of art developments. He mentioned that he had been working with the MTA and the City of Los Angeles on related issues which could lead to a public policy initiative in this area, and that the Air District had recently released a program notice to reinvigorate telework in the region.

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

Charlie Larwood, OCTA, P&P TAC Chair, reminded P&P TAC members that SCAG staff would like to receive comments as soon as possible on Items 5.1 and 5.2.

The meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held on Wednesday, April 14, 2010, from 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. at the SCAG Main Office in downtown Los Angeles.
